

Poverty Reduction and Gender Equality

**An Assessment of Sida's Country
Reports and Evaluations in 1995–96**

**Eva Tobisson
Stefan de Vylder**

**Secretariat for Policy and
Corporate Development**

Poverty Reduction and Gender Equality:

**An Assessment of Sida's Country
Reports and Evaluations in 1995-96**

**Eva Tobisson
Stefan de Vylder**

Sida Studies in Evaluation 97/2

**Secretariat for Policy and
Corporate Development**

Sida Studies in Evaluation is a series concerned with conceptual and methodological issues in the evaluation of development cooperation. It is published by Sida's Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit. Reports may be ordered from:

Bistandsforum, Sida
S-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: (+46) 8 698 57 22
Fax: (+46) 8 698 56 38

Authors: Eva Tobisson, Stefan de Vylder.

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the author's and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Studies in Evaluation 97/2
Commissioned by Sida, Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit.
Copyright: Sida and the authors

Registration No.: DNR Pol-1997-0146
Date of Final Report: October 1997
Printed in Stockholm, Sweden 1997
ISBN 1402—215X

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Sveavägen 20, Stockholm
Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (8)-20 88 64
Telegram: sida stockholm. Telex 11450 sida sthlm. Postgiro: 1 56 34-90
Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Table of Contents

Summary

1. Introduction
 - 1.1 Background and Objectives
 - 1.2 Methodology and Special Considerations
2. Conceptual Issues: Poverty and Gender
3. Findings
 - 3.1 Country Reports
 - 3.2 Evaluations
4. Conclusions and Suggestions

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

Annex 2: Country Reports: Findings

Annex 3: Evaluation Reports: Findings

Annex 4: Evaluation Reports: Findings by Departments

Annex 5: List of Evaluation Reports

Annex 6: List of References

Poverty Reduction and Gender Equality: An Assessment of Sida's Country Reports and Evaluations in 1995-96

Eva Tobisson & Stefan de Vylder

Stockholm, October 1997

Summary

Background and Purpose

The present report, commissioned by Sida's Department for Policy and Legal Services, is an assessment of the treatment of poverty reduction and gender equality in Sida policy documents and evaluation reports. Altogether, eleven Country Reports - comprising Results Analyses (Resultatanalyser), Country Analyses (Landanalyser) and Country Strategies (Landstrategier) - and 38 evaluation reports, written by external consultants, have been reviewed.

The documents reviewed are all produced between 1995 and early 1997, ie before Sida had formally adopted its ambitious Action Plans for poverty reduction and gender equality.

The report has attempted to answer two basic questions:

- How much attention is paid to poverty reduction and gender equality in the Country Strategies and evaluation reports?
- What can be said about the depth and quality of analysis?

Summary of Findings

- 1 By and large, scant attention is paid to poverty and gender issues in the country report documents and evaluations analysed. Somewhat surprisingly, given the long tradition of emphasis on poverty reduction in Swedish development cooperation, the analysis of poverty is not better than that of gender equality, which is much more recent as an explicit objective.
- 2 In terms of attention paid to poverty and gender, the ranking of the various documents examined would give the following picture:
 - Most attention (and best analysis): Country Analyses and Country Strategies

- Less attention: Results Analysis reports
 - Very little attention: evaluation reports.
- 3 With few exceptions, analysis is superficial, in particular in the evaluation reports. The treatment of poverty in the evaluation reports is usually limited to a few comments on poverty based on simple income criteria (ie percentage of population living below a certain poverty line), and the analysis of gender is either absent or limited to some remarks about the situation of women.
 - 4 The Terms of Reference (ToR) for evaluations almost never mention poverty reduction or gender equality as a major objective of the project/ programme that is being evaluated, and very rarely ask the consultants to pay special attention to poverty and gender issues. Judging from the evaluations we have reviewed, Sida has provided little guidance to the consultants as regards poverty and gender analysis.
 - 5 Among the different Sida departments responsible for the writing of the ToR and the commissioning of evaluations, NATUR pays, on average, slightly more attention to both poverty and gender than the other departments. The relevance of poverty and gender aspects is also highest for NATUR's projects and programmes.
 - 6 Somewhat surprisingly, DESO pays very little attention to poverty and gender issues in the design of ToR for DESO projects/programmes. While this can partly be explained by the fact that DESO is responsible for a large number of evaluations dealing with projects and programmes where the direct impact on poverty reduction and gender equality must be regarded as limited and difficult to analyse (eg support to the establishment of a Central Bank), DESO is also responsible for evaluations of social sector development programmes where poverty and gender issues ought to receive considerable attention.
 - 7 The fact that poverty and gender issues are not given much emphasis does not mean that the evaluation reports are "bad". We have not made an evaluation of the overall quality of the reports - only an attempt to assess to what extent the evaluations consider poverty and gender issues.
 - 8 If we compare our own assessments of the relevance of poverty and gender for various projects/programmes being evaluated (ie where these issues should or could have been addressed) with the attention paid to those issues in the ToR and evaluation reports, we get the following picture (scale 1-3, where 1 signifies low relevance, and 3 high relevance).

- I Our own assessment of relevance
- II Emphasis in ToR
- III Emphasis in evaluation reports

Responsible Department	Emphasis on						No. of Reports
	Poverty			Gender			
	I	II	III	I	II	III	
NATUR	2.8	1.5	1.3	2.8	1.7	1.5	6
DESO	1.8	1.0	1.2	1.9	1.0	1.2	13
SAREC	1.7	1.0	1.0	1.5	1.0	1.0	6
INEC	1.4	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.4	11
Others	1.5	1.0	1.0	1.5	1.0	1.0	2
Total	1.8	1.1	1.2	1.8	1.2	1.3	38

The table shows that there is a close correspondence between the attention paid to poverty and gender issues in the ToR and in the evaluation reports, although the latter get, on average, a marginally higher score than the ToR. By and large, the consultants responsible for the evaluations have followed their ToR in the treatment of poverty and gender: they have emphasised poverty and gender issues when they have been asked to do so, but not otherwise.

For all departments except INEC there is, however, a very large difference between our assessment of the relevance of poverty and gender and the treatment of these issues in the ToR and evaluations.

- 9 The fact that poverty and gender issues are given a much stronger emphasis in the Country Analyses and Country Strategies than in the different project evaluations - and in their ToR - requires further analysis. One reason could be that the overall composition of Swedish development cooperation is such that poverty reduction and gender equality are less important objectives than, for example, economic growth. There are also, however, numerous cases of evaluation reports which neglect poverty and gender issues even when the nature of the project makes such a discussion highly relevant. This indicates that there are serious systemic errors in the way the ToR are designed and evaluations are commissioned.

- 10 The lack of established methodology - and, quite often, data - for measuring the impact on poverty reduction and gender equality is evident in both evaluation reports and Sida's own Results Analysis reports. As indicated above, it also appears as if a large number of projects and programmes supported by Sida do not explicitly include poverty reduction or gender equality in their objectives.

- 11 To judge from the evaluation reports, the impact of the Swedish policy dialogue on the partner countries' own priorities as regards poverty and gender policies is negligible. In the case of gender equality, no case has been identified where Swedish priorities have influenced overall policies or attitudes (this does not mean, of course, that no such cases exist - only that they are not being identified in the evaluation reports).

1. Introduction

1.1 Background and objectives

Poverty reduction has been acknowledged as an essential goal of Swedish development cooperation policy and strategy from the very beginning. In fact, to "raise the living standards of poor people" has been the underlying, fundamental objective since 1962.

Yet, the attention paid to poverty reduction in operational terms has varied, largely depending on whether the prevailing development philosophy has been supportive or not. Firm directives and guidelines focusing on poverty reduction have been lacking. The same holds true for gender equality, which until recently has been treated - if at all - as a cross-cutting issue, rather than as a goal in itself.

The relative attention paid to these objectives has largely been determined by individual programme officers' interest and commitment, and by a general understanding that some projects and programmes are more relevant than others from a poverty reduction and gender equality perspective.

In recent years, issues related to poverty reduction and equality between women and men have received increased attention, and clarification. A Task Force on Poverty Reduction was established in early 1994, with a mandate to review Sida's experience in combatting poverty, to examine the needs and achievements of partner countries and to develop methods and approaches through which the poverty reduction objective could be mainstreamed in *all* Sida operations. A concrete outcome of the Task Force is a Programme of Action to Combat Poverty which officially came into force in February 1997.

In May 1996, the Swedish Parliament approved a proposition by Government to adopt equality between women and men as the sixth official objective for Sweden's development cooperation (the other five being economic growth, social and economic equality, democratic development, national independence and sustainable environmental management). A comprehensive gender training programme has been implemented since 1989, to ensure that Sida staff and consultants are aware of the gender equality objective and are familiar with gender concepts and professionally committed to firmly integrate a gender perspective into their work.

Sida's Gender Advisor and Gender Focal Point Network, which forms part of the Socio-Economic Analysis Unit at the Department for Policy and Legal Services, has coordinated the formulation of a comprehensive Action Programme for agency-wide implementation, which was launched in April 1997.

As part of Sida's efforts to improve and mainstream the poverty reduction and gender equality objectives, the Department for Policy and Legal Services commissioned the present study to two external consultants (Eva Tobisson, social anthropologist, and Stefan de Vylder, economist) to review the attention paid to the two objectives in evaluations and in Country Reports compiled during the first fiscal year of operation of the new Sida (Terms of Reference, Annex 1). The review is meant to serve as a baseline for subsequent inquiry into the treatment of the poverty reduction and gender equality objectives at later stages, when the two Action Programmes have been implemented.

1.2 Methodology and Special Considerations

A total of 38 evaluation reports and 11 sets of Country Reports (for each country or region: Results Analysis report, Country Analysis, and Country Strategy) produced during the fiscal year 1995/96 (18 months) has been reviewed. Since poverty reduction is not a guiding principle for Swedish development cooperation with countries in East and Central Europe, these reports were omitted from the review.

The review has been made with reference to relevant Sida guidelines, policy documents, manuals, and consultancy reports. Particularly useful sources of information and inspiration have been the consultancy reports by Eduards (1995) on the poverty reduction objective in relation to evaluations, by Carlsson *et al* (1997) on evaluation practice, by Alberts and Andersson (1996) on the treatment of environmental issues in Sida's evaluations and by Schill (1996) on the use of Results Analysis reports in the elaboration of Country Strategies. The present review gives further support to some of the more critical findings of those studies.

Our assessments of Country Reports were facilitated by the fact that Sida's guidelines stipulate that such reports *must* discuss the poverty reduction and gender equality objectives. We have therefore made no attempt to make comparisons of the relevance of these objectives between different countries: we have simply assumed that they are always relevant.

Evaluation reports, on the other hand, are bound to exhibit differences in terms of the demands that can reasonably be made with respect to meaningful discussions of poverty and gender issues depending upon, *inter alia*, sector or sub-sector, overriding objective, mode for implementation, programme or project design, etc. The sample of evaluations reviewed - ie all evaluations made during the period in question, except those dealing with Central and Eastern Europe - turned out to comprise a good number of

reports focusing on projects, programmes and activities where, according to our judgement, poverty and/or gender aspects were simply not directly relevant. While we agree that all activities that form part of Swedish development cooperation must comply with Sida's principal objectives (including poverty reduction and gender equality), the review of evaluation reports undertaken here would be quite impractical if we always applied the same criteria. For this reason, we have made an independent assessment of relevance of poverty reduction and gender equality objectives for each project/programme that has been evaluated, which we have compared with the attention paid to poverty and gender issues in the ToR and reports (Annex 3:3).

When assessing "relevance", we have concentrated on direct and short-term relevance. While all Swedish development assistance should, in the final analysis, contribute to poverty reduction and improved gender equality, an analysis of the indirect impact would have to be based on a comprehensive theory of development which would enable us to measure and compare the long-term effects on poverty and gender equality of, say, support to telecommunications versus biochemical research or primary education.

The evaluation of the Swedish-Malaysian forestry research cooperation (96/18) may serve to illustrate our basis for assessing relevance. While tropical rain forest management has obvious poverty and gender dimensions and implications, the research collaboration evaluated is confined to trials with selective logging and harvesting on experimental plots, and hence we have not deemed poverty and gender aspects as directly relevant.

In addition to differences pertaining to relevance and meaningfulness of an explicit poverty and gender focus for the evaluations, our task was complicated by the considerable variation exhibited in the quality and comprehensiveness of reports under review, and by the lack of consistency in terminology and approaches applied when issues related to poverty and gender were discussed. "Poverty reduction", "gender equality" and related terms rarely appear in the reports under review. To a large extent, our review has therefore been based on assessments of how poverty and gender issues were interpreted and discussed in a variety of different terms.

In most reports which treated "gender", discussions are limited to a few, scattered remarks on the situation of women. In order to make a clear distinction between these reports, and those which do not address the issue at all, we have applied a rather generous standard for assessing the treatment of gender issues in ToR and evaluation reports; at least some discussion of the situation of women in a relevant context is enough to avoid the lowest score.

The Country Reports and evaluations were assessed using two question formats prepared by the consultants (Annexes 2 and 3:1). Questions related to Country Reports focused primarily on the depth and quality of poverty and gender analysis, and on the extent to which ideas for additional projects/programmes which explicitly address the issues of poverty reduction and gender equality had been brought up. Given the relevance of the poverty reduction and gender equality goals for Swedish development cooperation with all countries in the South, and the explicit demand by Sida that these issues be brought up and discussed in all Country Reports, we have used the same criteria in all countries/regions.

The evaluation report format contains more questions, in order to enable a qualification of the attention paid to poverty and gender (eg our own assessment of relevance, direct/indirect impact, mainstreaming or "appendix" form of presentation, and identification of sub-groups) and to enable a comparison between ToR and reports as far as the treatment of poverty and gender issues are concerned.

The question formats were pre-tested by the joint reading of a sample of reports by the two consultants, and subsequently revised based on a critical comparison of the results. By and large, there was a close correspondence between the independent assessments.

Remaining reports were divided between the consultants, and judgements were continuously compared and discussed in order to secure a likemindedness of understanding and assessment. The subjective element in an exercise of this kind is, of course, considerable. It is likely that other consultants would get somewhat different results, and that our assessments in many cases would appear "too generous" to some observers, and "too critical" to others.

The remainder of this report is divided into three parts. The first part, which forms a background and a point of reference for the assessment, focuses on the notions of poverty reduction and gender equality in a Sida perspective. The findings from the review are presented and discussed in the second part, which forms the main body of the report. The presentation is made primarily in qualitative terms, with reference to the underlying and more detailed quantitative material which is available in the annexes. In a concluding section, we briefly identify a few issues which we feel require further attention by Sida.

In order to avoid possible misunderstandings, we would like to underline that the review has been confined to only two among the several different objectives for Swedish development cooperation. Hence, the critical comments we make in relation to individual evaluations and Country Reports as instru-

ments to help meet the poverty reduction and gender equality objectives do not imply that we question their value in a number of other important respects. Also, when we draw our examples from individual reports, it is not because the overall impression of those reports has been found to be exceptionally "good" or "bad" from a poverty and/or gender perspective, but because we have found them to be pertinent illustrations of some of our major observations.

2. Conceptual Issues: Poverty and Gender

Although as noted above poverty reduction has throughout the years constituted the principal goal of Swedish development cooperation, clear definitions and guidelines have until recently been lacking. The fact that Swedish development cooperation from the very beginning has been concentrated to partner countries classified as "extremely poor" was often seen as a guarantee for a strong poverty-orientation.

A number of studies and evaluation reports have, however, clearly shown that development cooperation with poor countries does not necessarily mean that poor people are the beneficiaries. The international discussion - not least stimulated by UNDP's Human Development Reports - has also contributed to a more flexible and complex notion and application of the poverty concept, from a more narrow focus on income to a concern about sustainable livelihoods in more qualitative terms. The perception of "the poor" as an undifferentiated group which could be defined by universal and uniform standards was gradually changed through a recognition that poverty could take on numerous guises. Hence, local criteria for relative poverty and wealth had to be taken into account and procedures had to be applied through which women and men in partner countries could actively participate in problem analysis, in setting priorities and in planning and implementing measures that could improve their lives.

Although the situation experienced by women, as well as their role as agents for development, has long been recognized in Swedish development cooperation, problem analyses and the identification of measures to improve their situation relative to men have changed over time. The dominant policy approach of Sida and other donors in the 1970s was "Women-in-Development" (WID). Women were placed in focus, not primarily as agents of change but as a vulnerable group which required special attention and specific measures. The WID focus was on income-generating activities, through which women were expected to improve both their own lives and those of their families. The WID approach, however, tended to treat women as an exclusive and excluded group within separate project or programme components, and to address symptoms rather than causes of women's problems.

Rather than improving women's relative position, many WID activities actually contributed to a continued marginalisation of women.

Parallel to activities focusing on women as a special group (commonly small-scale projects subject to special treatment, eg separate funding and administration by "women's programme officers"), a number of such projects and programmes thus tended to contribute to *worsening* the conditions experienced by women by completely neglecting their problems and opportunities for change. For instance, many agricultural development programmes have, contrary to their intentions, contributed to increase poor women's workload.

The narrow focus on women has in recent years been changed to a focus on gender roles and responsibilities (ie the cultural and social construction and interpretation of the biological characteristics of women and men, and the social and political relationships between them). The change was officially endorsed through the inclusion of equality between women and men as the sixth objective for Swedish development cooperation in 1996, and by renaming Sida's "Women's Division" to "Gender Unit" and, more recently, "Gender Equality Group". The new approach required a broader socio-cultural analysis, in which gender analysis was to be linked to inquiries into other social dimensions and processes, such as poverty. A basic premise has been that poverty has gender-specific causes and implications, that women and men can experience various aspects of poverty differently and that effective poverty reduction measures must be based on a thorough gender analysis as part of a comprehensive social analysis.

The new orientation has been supported by gender training programmes, encompassing Sida programme officers, officials in partner countries as well as consultants. Yet, in spite of these efforts, it is clear that the previous focus on women (as a vulnerable group), combined with a male bias resulting from a lack of gender perspective, has continued to dominate much of the practical development cooperation work. Although Country Gender Reports, or Profiles, have been compiled, a comprehensive gender analysis focusing on specific geographical areas, projects or programmes is rarely carried out. Much confusion remains regarding the meaning and use of gender in operational terms, and attempts to integrate a gender dimension of development as part of project planning and evaluations are in practice either completely absent or limited to a focus only on women.

Our own basis for assessing the attention paid to and the treatment of poverty and gender issues in the Country Reports and evaluations under review, reflect the understanding of poverty reduction and gender equality as expressed in the two recent Action Programmes and background documents.

That is, departing from a perception of poverty as a many-faceted and heterogenous phenomena which cannot be subject to a single, universal definition, the approach to poverty reduction must be part and parcel of broader social development approach. The definition of social development as "a process of enhanced individual and community well-being, capacity and freedom of choice, within an equitable and just society" (Promoting Sustainable Livelihoods, p 51), provides a suitable framework for context-specific definitions of poverty and for the identification of feasible poverty reduction measures which can help improving the quality of life of poor women, men and children.

Another point of departure for our assessment is that gender-based inequalities are closely connected with processes of impoverishment, and that equality between women and men is an important *societal* issue and not a women's issue. Yet, as noted under section 1.2, the utterly poor treatment of gender in the reports, and the fact that statements about "gender" with few exceptions are confined to scattered remarks about the situation experienced by women, has led us to apply a more generous standard of appraisal. Different from the assessment of the handling of poverty issues, a more stringent treatment of the gender concept would have excluded the vast majority of reports from *any* meaningful discussion about the attention paid to gender issues in a comparative perspective. Thus, when the situation of women has been brought up within an improved equality framework, although the connection is usually not made explicit, we have taken note of this in our assessment.

3. Findings

The questions we have asked, and the "scores" we have given each individual report, are listed in the annexes. In the presentation below, we will only highlight a few, salient observations.

3.1 Country Reports

Included under this heading are three different documents, which are all produced internally within Sida: Results Analysis reports (*resultatanalyser*), where an assessment is made of goal achievement of past Swedish development cooperation with the country/region in question, Country Analyses (*landanalyser*), where the overall economic and political situation of the country is analysed, and Country Strategies (*landstrategier*), where Sida outlines a medium-term strategy for Sweden's development cooperation with each country/region.

The key policy document is the Country Strategy, which is both an analytical and a policy-oriented document identifying problems and prospects for the respective country's medium-term development, and suggests suitable areas for Swedish development cooperation. The Country Analysis is, despite its name, of a more descriptive nature, and contains background information - including, sometimes, a wealth of economic and social statistics - which is used when the Country Strategy is formulated.

The Results Analysis report was traditionally a highly descriptive document containing key data on project costs, disbursements, etc. In October 1995, the Swedish government decided to change the character of this document,¹ and asked Sida to make it more analytical, and more useful as an input in the formulation of the Country Strategies.

All eleven Country Strategies reviewed in this report were produced in 1996, ie after the change in guidelines. The three different documents discussed should therefore be seen as belonging to the same "country strategy process".

Our assessment of the attention paid to poverty reduction and gender equality in each set of Country Report documents is presented in Annex 2. Suffice it here to indicate some of the key findings.

To begin with, a majority of the Results Analysis reports have devoted rather little attention to the objectives of poverty reduction and gender equality (see Table 3.1 below). Only in one case - Bangladesh - can the analysis be regarded as comprehensive and satisfactory.

¹ Utrikesdepartementet, *Beredningsordningen för landstrategier*, Regeringsbeslut 1995-10-26. For a good discussion on the use of Results Analysis reports after October 1995, see Schill (1996).

Table 3.1. **Results Analysis Reports:** Does the report discuss the extent to which Swedish development cooperation has contributed to the fulfilment of goals related to poverty reduction and gender equality?

	Number of cases	
	Poverty	Gender
1 Not explicitly discussed	3	6
2 Briefly touched upon (eg as regards possible side effects)	5	2
3 Some discussion/analysis	1	0
4 A more elaborate discussion	1	2
5 Thorough and satisfactory analysis	1	1
Average:	2.3	2.1

Possibly because of the "new" nature of the Results Analysis reports, there seems to have been a lack of understanding about the methodology to use when assessing the impact of Swedish development cooperation in areas related to poverty reduction and gender equality. In a number of cases, it is also clear that it has been difficult to identify concrete components of the Swedish aid programme which have had poverty reduction and gender equality as their major objectives.

As a result of these and other factors, the Results Analysis reports are exceedingly vague when it comes to measuring the impact on poverty reduction and gender equality of the Swedish development cooperation. In the case of gender equality, only four out of eleven reports even make an attempt; the corresponding figure for poverty reduction is seven. Of the reports which do contain a discussion indicating whether the results are "good" or "bad", hardly any take the analysis further, ie to a discussion of the *reasons* for poor or good goal fulfilment.

The Country Analyses are appreciably more satisfactory when it comes to discussing poverty and gender issues. Virtually all contain at least some discussion, and in around half of the cases (five out of ten for poverty, four out of ten in the case of gender equality) the discussion can be classified as "a more elaborate analysis".

Table 3.2. **Country Analyses:** To what extent does the Country Analysis analyse poverty and gender?

		Number of cases	
		Poverty	Gender
1	Not explicitly discussed	0	1
2	Briefly touched upon/ purely descriptive overview	4	4
3	Some discussion/analysis	4	3
4	A more elaborate analysis	2	2
5	Thorough and satisfactory analysis	0	0
Average:*		2.8	2.6

* One Country Analysis (Bangladesh) is lacking. The fact that it is Bangladesh - by far the most comprehensive Results Analysis report within the sample - that is missing makes the difference in average score between Table 3.1 and Table 3.2 appear smaller than it probably should be.

As regards the Country Strategies, these receive approximately the same average scores as the Country Analyses (see Annex 2). In a majority of cases (eight in the case of poverty reduction, six in the case of gender equality) the Country Strategies do discuss and suggest areas or projects suitable for future Swedish development cooperation.

3.2 Evaluations

The principal question posed in the Terms of Reference for our review of evaluation reports concerns the attention paid to *goal fulfilment* with regard to poverty reduction and gender equality. We have addressed this issue through focusing on the *relevance* of poverty and gender equality concerns for the project/activity under evaluation, and on the *attention* paid to poverty and gender issues in the ToR as well as in the evaluation reports. Our assessment centres primarily around notions of poverty and gender and quality of analysis in the reports.

Sida Guidelines for Evaluations

A point of departure for our appraisal is the extent to which poverty and gender aspects were made explicit in the general Sida guidelines for evaluations and in general instructions for the management of Swedish development cooperation applying in 1995/96. Sida's Evaluation Policy (1995, p 13) points out the significance of appraising the *effects* (intentional and unintentional) of the project/programme under evaluation, in relation to the goals of Swedish development cooperation, including poverty alleviation (reduction) and gender equality.

The Evaluation Manual for SIDA (Sida 1994) provides general and specific guidance. The Manual is widely used by programme officers as a basis for writing ToR (see Carlsson *et al* 1997). Yet, the considerable differences exhibited by the evaluation reports reviewed, as far as approach and structure are concerned, suggest that the Manual either is not used by the consultants, or is interpreted in different ways.

The Evaluation Manual brings up a number of issues of relevance to our review. Among those are the prime significance of carefully formulated and unambiguous ToR, recruitment of qualified evaluation teams, choice of team leader, clear definitions of concepts, measurement of the achievement of objectives in relation to stated beneficiary groups and analysis of the existence of causal relationships. It is noteworthy that the Manual does not specifically refer to the poverty reduction objective or to the need to address poverty factors and processes as part of evaluations. "Impact on women and men respectively" is referred to under the heading "Assessments to be made during evaluations", and gender analysis competence is implicit as a required qualification for evaluation teams.

Sida's Guidelines for Project Support (Metodhandboken, 1990) which contains management directives rather than details about the overall objectives and principles for Swedish development cooperation, brings up the importance of gender analysis as part of the problem analysis, but contains no references to the poverty reduction objective. Furthermore, the Sida Guidelines for Result-Based Planning, Management and Monitoring (1995) which are based on the Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) provide *no* guidance for the integration of poverty aspects and only limited direction as far as gender aspects are concerned.

Thus, in conclusion, the various Sida guidelines and manuals available in 1995/96 provided poor guidance for the integration of poverty reduction and gender equality concerns both in the formulation of ToR, in carrying out evaluations and in writing evaluation reports. Hence, the vagueness or

unavailability until recently of clear official instructions regarding the treatment of poverty reduction and gender equality must be kept in mind in the interpretation of our results.

General Impressions

The question format/legend and the review summary of evaluation reports are attached as Annex 3:1-3. Annex 4 contains a breakdown and average scores for different Sida departments.

Considering the fairly extensive time-period covered, the sample should represent a reasonable cross-section of evaluations undertaken by Sida. In this perspective we were quite surprised at finding that poverty and gender aspects could not be seen as directly relevant to quite a number of evaluation reports under review. Out of the total 38 reports, we judged 13 as of "low relevance", 15 as "medium relevant" and 10 as "highly relevant" from a poverty reduction perspective. The corresponding figures for relevance from a gender equality perspective were 15, 13 and 10 reports respectively.

An interesting issue for further inquiry is whether the relatively large proportion in the sample of "low relevance" reports is accidental. It could be the case that the sample reflects a general disregard for poverty reduction and gender equality objectives in contemporary Swedish development cooperation. It is also plausible that the sample reveals a relatively low priority given to evaluating the kind of projects and programmes which have a more profound and direct poverty and gender orientation.

Poverty reduction was identified as a major programme/project objective only in two ToR and in three evaluation reports, and gender equality was declared to be a principal programme/project goal in not more than two ToR and two reports. Although the thirteen evaluations undertaken by DESO represent a wide variety of projects and programmes, they include what we have identified as some of the most significant ones from a poverty reduction and gender equality perspective. It is therefore noteworthy that *none* of these have identified poverty and/or gender as a principal project or programme objective.

Regarding reports that we have classified as of "medium" or "high" relevance from a poverty and/or gender perspective, our overall conclusion is that *both ToR and evaluation reports have paid surprisingly little attention to poverty and gender issues*. The minor attention devoted to those issues is in some cases quite remarkable. One example is the SIDA-supported Artisanal Fisheries Programme in Guinea Bissau (96/20) which has focused on an area

inhabited by marginalized small-scale farming and fishing populations. The evaluation of Sida Support to the Education Sector in Ethiopia (96/27) is another case in point; while highly relevant from the point of view of poverty reduction and gender equality, there is hardly any discussion at all of such issues.

The largest discrepancy between our assessment of relevance and actual treatment in ToR and reports applies to evaluations commissioned by NATUR and DESO (see Annex 4). Although NATUR by comparison exhibits the highest treatment scores for both ToR and reports (1.5 and 1.7 in ToR and 1.3 and 1.5 in reports for poverty and gender respectively), this is still far below our score 2.8 for both ToR and reports. DESO's poverty and gender scores (1.0 in ToR and 1.2 for the reports) are much lower than our own assessment of relevance which is 1.8 for poverty and 1.9 for gender.

Another general conclusion is that when poverty or gender is addressed in the ToR and in the reports, *the information provided tends to be scanty, the concepts blurred and the analysis poor*. Accounts of poverty are generally confined to sweeping statements, based on biased and simplistic cause and effect relationships lacking analytical support. A common underlying assumption is the existence of a straightforward relationship between economic growth and poverty reduction. Also, information and analysis of gender as a social construct are exceedingly scarce, eg as reflected in discussions of specific gender divisions of labour, economic roles, responsibilities and needs. Sex-disaggregated statistics are rarely included (although such statistics are today available in many developing countries). While some reports have indicated an acceptance of a gender approach, and although the term gender occasionally appears in headings, the information and analyses are, with few exceptions, narrowly confined to women.

Only two reports identified a positive impact of the Swedish *policy dialogue* on the partner countries' priorities as regards poverty reduction (96/25 on the National Soil Conservation Programme in Kenya, and 96/47 on Local Development in Nicaragua), while not a single report suggests a positive impact for gender equality.

Although lack of information has made it impossible to correlate the quality of treatment of poverty and gender issues in the reports with the professional background and experience of the evaluation teams, at least one interesting observation can be made. Three of the five reports having the highest scores as far as the treatment of gender equality is concerned had sociologists or anthropologists on the evaluation teams (in two cases as team leaders). These reports (96/23, 96/25 and 96/47) are also among the very few which contain a discussion of direct or indirect effects of the project/programme on

improved gender equality. Also, the gender analysis is mainstreamed in the reports and forms part of a broader socio-cultural analysis. The same three reports also produced high scores for the general treatment and analysis of poverty issues.

Comparing Terms of Reference and Evaluation Reports

Eduards in his review of 75 Sida evaluations (1995) found a close correlation between the lack of attention paid to poverty aspects in the ToR and the lack of information and analysis provided in the evaluation reports. The review presented here not only confirms these findings as far as the poverty focus is concerned, but also shows that the same applies to gender perspectives. A conclusion arrived at in both reviews is that *a principal reason why poverty aspects are poorly covered in Sida evaluations is that the ToR have not required the consultants to look into these aspects.*

In most cases when poverty and/or gender issues are referred to in the ToR, it is generally in passing and as part of the background information (with reference to the overall objectives for Swedish development cooperation) rather than as a guidance to the evaluation task. Also, what ought to have been a focus on gender issues tends to be confined to a focus on women (eg 96/23 Water Supply Systems in Dodota - Ethiopia). Only in one case (96/47: Local Development Programme, Nicaragua) did the ToR contain a more elaborate discussion of poverty issues, and merely three ToR were found to contain at least some discussion of gender issues. A point of interest is that the latter three reports deal with water and sanitation programmes (ie 96/10: Rural Water Supplies in Botswana; 96/11: UNICEF's Programme for Water and Sanitation in Central America; 96/23: Water Supply Systems in Dodota, Ethiopia). Not in one single case did the ToR identify poverty and/or gender issues as a special focus for the evaluation.

The treatment of poverty and gender issues was generally found to be marginally better in the reports than in the ToR, although it should be noted that not a single report was found to contain what we would call a thorough and satisfactory analysis. In one-third of the reports under review, poverty and/or gender issues (usually with a focus on women) were discussed more extensively, in spite of the fact that the ToR had not requested such information. A case in point is the evaluation of the National Soil and Water Conservation Programme in Kenya (96/25). While the ToR only contains a general remark that women are highly involved in soil conservation work (under Background), the report presents a fairly inclusive account of the situation experienced by women in a gender perspective. Another example is the evaluation report of public administration in Mongolia (96/50). Although the term gender does not even appear in the ToR, the report contains both sex-disaggrega-

ted statistics (with regard to training) as well as gender-based conclusions (eg gender analysis to be made in relation to the local socio-cultural context) and recommendations (eg seminars on gender awareness and the need to formulate a gender strategy). A third illustration is the evaluation of a concessionary credit scheme in Zimbabwe (96/42). In spite of the fact that poverty issues are not at all referred to in the ToR, and gender aspects are mentioned in passing only, the report contains an extensive discussion of both poverty and gender implications of the Swedish support.

A comparison between different Sida departments shows that NATUR has the highest average scores for the treatment of poverty and gender aspects in the ToR as well as in the reports. SAREC has the lowest average score for the treatment of poverty issues in both ToR and reports, while SAREC and INEC score equally low in the attention paid to gender aspects in the ToR (Annex 4).

By and large, the evaluations which neglect to discuss poverty issues also tend to neglect gender equality.

Notions of Poverty and Gender and Quality of Analysis

Terms such as "poverty", "poor people" and "poverty reduction" only exceptionally surface in the ToR under review. Yet, the frequent references to programme or project objectives in terms of "increased employment" "raised income" and "improved macroeconomic management" reflect an underlying notion that there is a simple, straightforward correlation between economic growth and poverty reduction (and sometimes between macroeconomic stabilisation and poverty reduction). The effects on poverty are assumed to be indirect, but are taken for granted, and are usually not spelled out even as indirect effects. If a particular activity - be it support to agricultural research, or to a Central Bank - is considered good for the overall economic development of the country in question, it is implicitly assumed that poverty reduction will follow.

When the term gender appears in the ToR, the underlying assumption is that an improvement of the situation of women (eg through income opportunities and/or education) will automatically lead to improved gender equality (eg 96/23 on Water Supplies in Dodota - Ethiopia). A male bias surfaces in some of the ToR, eg in the SIDA-supported Artisanal Fisheries Programme in Guinea Bissau (96/20) which contains several references to "the fishermen communities", while completely neglecting the fact that the people in the project area derive their subsistence from a combination of farming and fisheries, involving men as well as women. In the vast majority of cases,

neither gender aspects nor the situation experienced by women are brought up in the ToR.

The obscurity in terminology in the ToR is matched by a similar ambiguity in the use of terms in the evaluation reports, and in the (often implicit) understanding of the causes of and remedies for poverty and gender inequality. The report from the evaluation of Swedish support to a concessionary credit scheme in Zimbabwe (96/42), which generally scored high in our assessment for its treatment of gender issues, contains conclusions based on indirect impact which are sometimes questionable. One example is the conclusion that the Scania Truck project benefits women, the reason being that the cotton and tobacco that are grown primarily by women can be transported from the area (p.38). Whether or not it is women or men who control the income from sales of those crops is not clear from the report. A gender analysis may well show that the women have to put more efforts into the production of cotton and tobacco, in order for men to reap a higher profit from the increased marketing opportunities resulting from improved transport facilities.

Most evaluations have completely neglected the gender dimension, while some contain piecemeal information about the situation experienced by women. Even when the term gender appears in some of the reports (eg in headings), there is a tendency to focus only on women rather than on women's situation relative to that of men. The evaluation of the Sida/SAREC Marine Science Programme in Eastern Africa (96/35) may serve as an illustration. The information provided in the four-line section under the heading "Gender Issues" is confined to an account of the number of male and female students at the Department of Biology, Eduardo Mondlane University in Mozambique, and to a remark that the previous Head of Department was a woman (p 18). Quite contrary to our expectations, the report describes the East African marine and coastal environmental resource system without any references to the fact that men and women in coastal communities may perform different (often complementary) tasks, control different resources and hence may be affected differently by processes of environmental degradation and by measures to improve the environment.

Only three reports identify sub-categories of "the poor" and identify specific groups of women with different problems and needs. The report on a Local Development Programme in Nicaragua (96/47) identifies women-headed households in marginal neighbourhoods and women who work in home-based enterprises as important sub-groups of programme beneficiaries. The vast majority of reports refer to the intended project or programme beneficiaries as "local people", "local inhabitants", "villagers", "stakeholders", etc, without specifying sub-groups with special needs or opportunities for change.

National trends in the increase or decrease of poverty and gender equality are discussed more or less extensively in altogether six reports. The Nicaragua report (96/47) contains a comprehensive discussion of trends and direct impact with regard to both poverty and gender issues. A discussion of trends in terms of indirect impact on poverty is brought forward in the evaluation dealing with support to the opening of two road corridors in Angola (positive impact on poverty reduction through fostering national economic and social development, p.22).

4. Conclusions and Suggestions

As emphasised throughout this report, the overall conceptual precision and treatment of poverty reduction and gender equality in the documents reviewed are unsatisfactory. Somewhat surprisingly, given the long tradition of emphasis on poverty reduction in Swedish development cooperation, the analysis of poverty issues can hardly be said to be better than that of gender equality, which is much more recent as an explicit objective.

When poverty reduction and gender equality are at all brought up in the reports under review, the discussions and analyses are only exceptionally linked with and based on a broader context-specific social analysis in which socio-cultural and economic perspectives are firmly integrated.

The usefulness of country report documents and evaluations as instruments for further learning in the planning, management and monitoring of projects and programmes is largely determined by the procedures and methodologies applied and by the professional qualifications of Sida staff and consultants involved. Our general impression is that the majority of reports in our sample would have been much more useful to Sida, in terms of integrating poverty reduction and gender equality concerns, if better guidance had been provided.

There are pronounced differences between the different kinds of country report documents. On average, the policy documents - Country Analyses and Country Strategies - contain more information, and a better analysis, than the Results Analysis reports.

The lack of established methodology - and, quite often, data - for measuring the impact on poverty reduction and gender equality is evident from the Results Analysis reports. There can, however, also be another reason for the unsatisfactory treatment of impact: a large number of projects and programmes supported by Sida do not specify poverty reduction or gender equality as an explicit objective. It is therefore likely that the units responsible for the Results Analysis reports have been unable to identify specific

activities with a measurable impact in these respects. This may explain a large part of the silence.

This observation also suggests that the overall composition of Swedish development cooperation is such that aid objectives other than poverty reduction and gender equality - such as economic growth - are more important in operational terms, and that poverty reduction is implicitly or (occasionally) explicitly assumed to follow.

The fact that our own assessment of relevance of poverty reduction and gender equality objectives in the 38 projects/programmes that have been evaluated during the period under review is rather low - ie lower than two, in a scale from one (low relevance) to three (high relevance) - would support the hypothesis that Swedish development cooperation is largely driven by other objectives than (direct) poverty reduction and gender equality. We would, however, like to stress the provisional character of this conclusion. The sample of 38 projects and programmes that have been evaluated is fairly small, and we have made no attempt to try to assess how representative it is.

Whatever the criteria used, it is clear that the majority of evaluation reports are exceedingly unsatisfactory in their treatment of poverty and gender issues. It is noteworthy, however, that a comparison of evaluation reports and their Terms of Reference shows a very close correspondence. Indeed, the reports get, on average, a slightly higher score than their ToR. The neglect of poverty and gender issues in Sida's evaluations appears to stem from a corresponding neglect from the units responsible for the design of the ToR. In this respect our review confirms the findings of Eduards (1995) and Alberts/Andersson (1996): by and large, the consultants do what they are asked to do.

The consultants also tend to do what they are capable of doing. An evaluation team composed of, for example, one engineer and one expert in financial economics cannot reasonably be expected to handle issues related to poverty reduction and gender equality in a satisfactory way.

If poverty and gender issues are considered to be significant in evaluations, it is absolutely essential to design appropriate Term of Reference, to make sure that the required competence is available in evaluation teams and that team leaders are able and willing to adopt an approach in which poverty reduction and gender equality are placed at the centre. This may, however, be expensive: a satisfactory analysis of the impact on poverty reduction and gender equality tends to require much time, knowledge and understanding.

It is also imperative to achieve a better balance between the rather high importance attached to poverty reduction and gender equality in the strategic policy documents - such as Country Strategies - and the weak attention paid to these objectives in Results Analysis reports and evaluation reports.

The present imbalance is striking. It is far easier to talk about poverty reduction and gender equality in a politically correct way than to do something about it. While Country Analyses and Country Strategies pay lip service to poverty and gender issues, the actual design of projects and programmes indicates that while poverty reduction and gender equality may get "priority", the funds tend to go somewhere else.

The recent Programmes of Action for Poverty Reduction and Gender Equality represent a potential for bridging some of the gaps between policy and operational strategies and measures.

Uppdragsbeskrivning

I syfte att fastställa kvaliteten på behandlingen av fattigheds- och jämställdhetsfrågan i landstrategidokument och utvärderingar innan Sidas handlingsprogram för fattighedsbekämpning och jämställdhet mellan könen antogs, skall en konsultstudie enligt nedanstående uppdragsbeskrivning genomföras.

Konsulten skall granska landstrategidokument, dvs resultatanalyser, landanalyser och landstrategier och utvärderingsrapporter som utarbetades under nya Sidas första budgetår 1995/96 för att utröna i vilken utsträckning och på vilket sätt dessa dokument behandlat biståndets mål avseende (a) minskning av fattigdom och (b) uppnående av jämställdhet mellan män och kvinnor. När det gäller *landstrategidokument* skall granskningen undersöka

- i. om problemställningar som är relevanta för dessa mål analyserats på ett sätt som är till nytta för val och beredning av insatser
- ii. om resultatanalysen sökt bedöma uppfyllelsen av de båda målen
- iii. om strategin beaktar de båda målen genom att föreslå områden för insatser eller genom att motivera frånvaron av sådana förslag.

När det gäller *utvärderingsrapporterna* skall konsulten undersöka

- iv. huruvida något av de båda målen angivits som projektets huvudmål eller som önskvärda bieffekter
- v. där så skett, i vilken utsträckning rapporten bedömer att målen i fråga nåtts
- vi. faktorer som enligt utvärderingen påverkat måluppfyllelsen.

Studien avser att ge Sida en baslinje som visar kvaliteten på landstrategier och utvärderingar *innan* verkets handlingsprogram mot fattigdom och för jämställdhet antogs. Det är därför angeläget att konsulten fäster uppmärksamhet vid metodfrågorna, både när det gäller dokumentens struktur och angreppssätt och när det gäller de indikatorer som valts för att mäta måluppfyllelse.

Studien skall resultera i en rapport på högst 20 textsidor som skall presenteras vid ett seminarium på Sida i oktober 1997.

Annex 2. Country Reports: Findings

Included under the heading "country reports" are three different documents, which are all produced internally within Sida: "results analysis reports" (**resultatanalyser**), where an assessment is made of goal achievement of past Swedish assistance to the country/region in question, "country analyses" (**landanalyser**), where the overall economic and political situation of the country is analysed, and "country strategies" (**landstrategier**), where Sida outlines a medium-term strategy for Sweden's development assistance to each country/region.

1) **Results Analysis Reports.** Do the reports discuss the extent to which Swedish aid has contributed to the fulfilment of goals related to poverty reduction and gender equality?

1. Not explicitly discussed
2. Briefly touched upon (e.g. as regards possible side effects)
3. Some discussion/analysis
4. A more elaborate discussion
5. Thorough and satisfactory analysis

Country/Region	Poverty	Gender
Bangladesh	5	5
Bolivia	4	4
Cambodia	2	1
Central America	2	1
China	1	1
India	3	4
Mozambique	2	1
Philippines	1	1
Tanzania	2	2
Uganda	2	2
Zimbabwe	1	1
Average	2.3	2.1

2) **Results Analysis Reports.** What score do the reports give as regards goal fulfilment related to poverty alleviation and gender equality?

Scale 1-5 (1 = very poor goal fulfilment, 3 = acceptable, 5 = excellent. - signifies not discussed at all, or discussed in a way that makes an assessment of goal achievement impossible)

Country/Region	Poverty	Gender
Bangladesh	4	4
Bolivia	3	3
Cambodia	2	-
Central America	2	-
China	-	-
India	4	4
Mozambique	1	-
Philippines	-	-
Tanzania	-	-
Uganda	2	2
Zimbabwe	-	-
Number of cases where the issue is discussed	7	4

3) **Country Analyses.** To what extent does the country analysis analyse poverty and gender?

1. Not explicitly discussed
2. Briefly touched upon/
purely descriptive overview
3. Some discussion/analysis
4. A more elaborate analysis
5. Thorough and satisfactory analysis

Country/Region	Poverty	Gender
Bangladesh *	-	-
Bolivia	3	2
Cambodia	2	1
Central America	4	4
China	2	3
India	2	2
Mozambique	3	4
Philippines	4	3
Tanzania	3	3
Uganda **	2	2
Zimbabwe	3	2
Average	2.8	2.6

* Landanalys missing

** Called "landöversikt"

4) **Country Strategies.** How well does the country strategy analyse issues related to poverty reduction and gender equality?

1. Not explicitly discussed
2. Briefly touched upon (e.g. as regards possible side effects)
3. Some discussion/analysis
4. A more elaborate discussion
5. Thorough and satisfactory analysis

Country/Region	Poverty		Gender	
	1	2	3	4
Bangladesh		4		4
Bolivia		3		3
Cambodia		3		2
Central America		3		3
China		2		2
India		3		3
Mozambique		4		3
Philippines		3		1
Tanzania		2		1
Uganda *		-		-
Zimbabwe		2		2
Average		2.9		2.4

* One "landstrategi" (Uganda) is part of the "landöversikt"

5) **Country Strategies.** Does the country strategy discuss and suggest areas or projects suitable for Swedish aid which explicitly address the issue of poverty reduction or gender equality?

Country/Region	Poverty		Gender	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Bangladesh	+		+	
Bolivia	+		+	
Cambodia	+			+
Central America	+		+	
China		+		+
India	+		+	
Mozambique	+		+	
Philippines	+			+
Tanzania	+		+	
Uganda *	-	-	-	-
Zimbabwe		+		+
Total	8	2	6	4

* Country strategy missing

Annex 3:1

Question Format and Legend: Evaluation Reports

Question 1) Importance of poverty reduction and gender equality in ToR

- Not explicitly mentioned
- Briefly touched upon (eg possible side effects)
- Some discussion (eg indirect effects)
- A more elaborate discussion
- Special focus

[1]
[2]
[3]
[4]
[5]

Question 2) Treatment of poverty reduction and gender equality in the evaluation report

- Not explicitly mentioned
- Briefly touched upon (eg possible side effects)
- Some discussion (eg indirect effects)
- A more elaborate discussion
- Thorough and satisfactory analysis

[1]
[2]
[3]
[4]
[5]

Question 3) Is poverty reduction and/or gender equality explicitly seen as a major objective of the project/activity being evaluated? (ToR and evaluation report)

- Poverty evaluation
- Gender equality

[Y/N]
[Y/N]

Question 4) Are the effects discussed for poverty reduction and gender equality direct, indirect or both? (ToR and evaluation report)

- Analysis of direct effects
- Analysis of indirect effects
- No real discussion

[Dir]
[Ind]
[ND]

Question 5) Identification of poor, disadvantaged and vulnerable groups? (ToR and evaluation report)

- Poverty alleviation
- Gender equality

[Y/N]
[Y/N]

Question 6) Analysis of poverty and gender issues "mainstreamed" or in "appendix form"? (evaluation report)

- Mainstreamed
- Appendix status
- No real analysis

[Ms]
[App]
[NA]

Question 7) Analysis of national trends in poverty and gender equality? (evaluation report)

- Poverty alleviation
- Gender equality

[Y/N]
[Y/N]

Question 8) Positive impact of the Swedish policy dialogue on the partner country's own priorities? (evaluation report)

- Poverty alleviation
- Gender equality

[Y/N]
[Y/N]

Evaluation Reports: Relevance in Relation to Emphasis of Poverty and Gender Aspects in ToR and Reports

Report:	Poverty			Gender		
	I	II	III	I	II	III
95/1	2	1	1	2	1	1
95/2	2	1	1	2	1	1
95/3	1	1	1	1	1	1
95/4	1	1	1	1	1	1
96/1	1	1	1	1	1	1
96/2	2	1	1	1	1	1
96/3	2	1	1	1	1	1
96/5	1	1	1	1	1	1
96/6	2	1	1	2	1	1
96/7	3	1	1	3	1	1
96/9	1	1	1	1	1	1
96/10	3	2	1	3	2	1
96/11	3	2	2	3	2	1
96/12	1	1	1	1	1	1
96/16	1	1	1	1	1	1
96/18	2	1	1	1	1	1
96/19	1	1	1	1	1	1
96/20	3	2	1	2	1	1
96/21	2	1	1	2	1	1
96/23	2	1	1	3	2	3
96/25	3	1	2	3	2	2
96/26	3	1	1	3	1	1
96/27	3	1	1	3	1	1
96/28	1	1	1	2	1	1
96/35	3	1	1	3	1	1
96/37	2	1	1	2	1	1
96/39	2	1	1	2	1	1
96/40	2	1	1	2	1	1
96/41	3	1	2	3	1	3
96/42	1	1	2	1	2	2
96/43	1	1	1	1	1	1
96/44	2	1	1	2	1	1
96/45	2	1	1	2	1	1
96/47	3	3	3	3	2	3
96/48	1	1	1	1	1	1
96/49	2	1	2	2	2	2
96/50	2	1	1	2	1	2
97/1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Average	1.9	1.1	1.2	1.9	1.2	1.3

Legend:

I Our own assessment of relevance
 II Emphasis in ToR
 III Emphasis in evaluation reports

1 Low relevance
 2 Medium relevance
 3 High relevance

Annex 4. Evaluation Reports: Findings by Departments

1) Importance of poverty reduction and gender equality in the ToR.

1. Not explicitly mentioned
2. Briefly touched upon (e.g. as regards possible side effects)
3. Some discussion (e.g. as regards indirect effects)
4. A more elaborate discussion
5. Special focus

Average score: (number of observations/evaluations within brackets)

		Poverty	Gender
NATUR	(6)	1.7	2.4
DESO	(13)	1.1	1.5
SAREC	(6)	1.0	1.2
INEC	(11)	1.4	1.2
Others	(2)	1.3	1.5
Total	38	1.3	1.5

2) Treatment of poverty reduction and gender in the evaluation reports.

1. Not mentioned at all
2. Briefly touched upon (e.g. as regards possible side effects)
3. Some discussion (e.g. as regards indirect effects)
4. A more elaborate discussion
5. Thorough and satisfactory analysis

Average score	Poverty	Gender
NATUR	1.9	2.5
DESO	1.4	1.9
SAREC	1.0	1.5
INEC	1.7	1.8
Others	1.0	2.0
Total	1.5	1.9

3) Is poverty reduction and/or gender equality explicitly seen as a major objective of the project/activity being evaluated?

	ToR		Evaluation report	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Poverty reduction				
NATUR	1	5	1	5
DESO	0	13	0	13
SAREC	0	6	0	6
INEC	1	10	2	9
Others	0	2	0	2
Total	2	36	3	35

Gender equality

NATUR	2	4	1	5
DESO	0	13	0	13
SAREC	0	6	0	6
INEC	1	10	1	10
Others	0	2	0	2
Total	3	35	2	36

4) Direct or indirect impact. Are the effects that are discussed direct or indirect, or both?

	Poverty		Gender	
	Direct ef.	Indir.	Direct ef.	Indir.
NATUR	1	3	1	2
DESO	0	2	2	1
SAREC	0	0	0	0
INEC	1	4	1	4
Others	0	0	0	0
Total	2	9	4	7

No real discussion

	Poverty	Gender
NATUR	3	4
DESO	11	10
SAREC	6	6
INEC	7	7
Others	2	2
Total	29	29

5) Identification of poor and vulnerable groups. Does the evaluation report explicitly attempt to identify groups which are particularly "poor", "vulnerable", "disadvantaged" or "discriminated against" in the analysis of poverty and gender?

	Poverty	Gender
Yes		
NATUR	2	2
DESO	0	0
SAREC	0	0
INEC	1	1
Others	0	0
Total	3	3
No		
NATUR	4	5
DESO	13	13
SAREC	6	6
INEC	10	10
Others	2	2
Total	35	35

6) Relevance - in our opinion - of poverty reduction and gender equality in the project/programme in question.

1= low relevance 2=medium relevance 3=high relevance

	Poverty	Gender
NATUR	2.8	2.8
DESO	1.8	1.9
SAREC	1.7	1.5
INEC	1.4	1.4
Others	1.5	1.5
Total	1.8	1.8

7) **Emphasis in ToR and evaluation reports as regards poverty reduction and gender.** Is the treatment of poverty and gender more or less comprehensive/satisfactory in the evaluation report compared with the Terms of Reference and with what could be expected, given the character of the project/programme?

1=low relevance 2=medium relevance 3=high relevance

	Poverty	Gender
Relevance (from question 6)		
NATUR	2.8	2.8
DESO	1.8	1.9
SAREC	1.7	1.5
INEC	1.4	1.4
Others	1.5	1.5
Total	1.8	1.8

Emphasis in Terms of Reference

NATUR	1.5	1.7
DESO	1.0	1.0
SAREC	1.0	1.0
INEC	1.2	1.2
Others	1.0	1.0
Total	1.1	1.2

Emphasis in evaluation report

NATUR	1.3	1.5
DESO	1.2	1.2
SAREC	1.0	1.0
INEC	1.3	1.4
Others	1.0	1.0
Total	1.2	1.3

8) **Mainstreaming.** Is the analysis of poverty and gender "mainstreamed", or only presented in the form of "appendix"?
 Number of evaluations.

	Poverty	Gender
Analysis is "mainstreamed"		
NATUR	2	2
DESO	1	1
SAREC	0	0
INEC	2	2
Others	0	1
Total	5	6

The issue is given an "appendix status"

NATUR	0	1
DESO	1	2
SAREC	0	0
INEC	1	2
Others	0	0
Total	2	5

No real analysis

NATUR	4	3
DESO	11	10
SAREC	6	6
INEC	8	7
Others	2	2
Total	31	27

9) **Analysis of trends.** Does the evaluation report discuss the development over time of trends in poverty and gender equality in the country in question?

	Poverty		Gender	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
NATUR	2	4	1	5
DESO	1	12	0	13
SAREC	0	6	0	6
INEC	2	9	1	10
Others	0	2	0	2
Total	5	33	2	36

10) **Policy dialogue.** Does the evaluation report identify a positive impact of the Swedish policy dialogue on the recipient country's own priorities as regards poverty reduction and gender equality?

	Poverty		Gender	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
NATUR	1	5	0	6
DESO	0	13	0	13
SAREC	0	6	0	6
INEC	1	10	0	11
Others	0	2	0	1
Total	2	36	0	37

- 95/1 Pehrsson, K. *Educação Ambiental em Mocambique. Avaliação de um projecto no Instituto Superior Pedagógico na Beira*. Department for Democracy and Social Development.
- 95/2 Samoff, J. *Agitators, Incubators, Advisers - What Roles for the EPUs? An Evaluation of South African Education Units Supported by Sweden*. Department for Research Cooperation.
- 95/3 Kenny, L, and Kasale, B. *Swedish African Museum Programme (SAMP). An Evaluation*. Department for Democracy and Social Development.
- 95/4 Solheim, J.A. and Winai, P. *Evaluation of the Establishing of the Bank of Namibia 1990-1995*. Department for Democracy and Social Development.
- 96/1 Heileman, A and Peck, L. *The Beira-Gothenburg Twinning Programme - Cooperation for Municipal Development*. Department for Democracy and Social Development.
- 96/2 Nars, K. *Debt Management. Swedish Support to the Ministry of Finance, Kenya*. Department for Democracy and Social Development.
- 96/3 Rylander, L, Rundin, U, et.al. *Telecommunications. A Swedish Contribution to Development. Evaluation of BITS' Support to Telecommunications Development*. Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation.
- 96/5 Åhlund, C. *Democratic Development and Human Rights in Ethiopia. Swedish Assistance 1991-95*. Department for East and West Africa.
- 96/6 Nabais, J, Skogsberg, E-M, and Helling, L. *Estruturação de Gestão de Recursos Humanos. Projecto MAE/ASDI Mocambique*. Department for Democracy and Social Development.
- 96/7 Ballara, M, Bacchetto, S, Dawalbeit, A, Babosa, J M and Wallberg, B. *Apoio Sueco ao Sector da Educação na Guiné Bissau 1992-96*. Department for Democracy and Social Development.
- 96/9 Thulstrup, E W, Fekadu, M and Negewo, A. *Building Research Capacity in Ethiopia*. Department for Research Cooperation.
- 96/10 Valdelin, J, Browne, D, Alexander, E, Boman, K, Grönvall, M, Molokomme, I and Settergren, G. *Rural Village Water Supply Programme - Botswana*. Department for Natural Resources and the Environment.
- 96/11 Valdelin, J, Adelstål, L, Sawyer, R, Núñez, R, del Torres, X and Gubler, D. *UNICEF's Programme for Water and Sanitation in Central America*. Department for Natural Resources and the Environment.
- 96/12 Malmqvist, T and Wallberg, B. *Cooperative Environment Programme. Asian Institute of Technology-Sida 1993-1996*. Department for Democracy and Social Development.

- 96/16 Green, B and Law, P. *Swedish Support to Botswana Railways*. Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation.
- 96/18 Whitmore, T C. *Swedish-Malaysian Research Cooperation on Tropical Rain Forest Management Systems*. Department for Research Cooperation.
- 96/19 Nieto, A. *Sida/SAREC Supported Collaborative Programme for Biomedical Research Training in Central America*. Department for Research Cooperation.
- 96/20 Alberts, T and Alexanderson, C. *The Swedish Fisheries Programme in Guinea Bissau, 1977-1995*. Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
- 96/21 Andreasson, B, Grongstad, S, Hveding, V and Kårhammar, R. *The Electricity Sector in Mozambique*. Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation.
- 96/23 Olsson, B, Narrowe, J, Asfaw, N, Tefera, E and Negussie, B. *Water Supply Systems in Dodota - Ethiopia*. Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
- 96/25 Tiffen, M, Purcell, R, Gichuki, F, Gachene, C and Gathery, J. *National Soil and Water Conservation Programme, Kenya*. Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
- 96/26 Kamugisha, J R and Semu, E. *Soil and Water Conservation Research Project at Kari, Muguga - Kenya*. Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
- 96/27 Valdelin, J, Wort, M, Christensson, I and Cederblad, G. *Sida Support to the Education Sector in Ethiopia 1992-1995*. Department for Democracy and Social Development.
- 96/28 Helander, M. *Strategic Business Alliances in Costa Rica*. Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation.
- 96/35 Rudengren, J, Brinck, P and Davy, B. *Sida/SAREC Marine Science Programs. Bilateral Programs in Tanzania and Mozambique and the Regional Programme of East Africa*. Department for Research Cooperation.
- 96/37 Eriksson, C H and Möller, G. *The Opening of the Two Road Corridors in Angola*. Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation.
- 96/39 Sanderatne, N and Nilsson J S. *Sri Lankan-Swedish Research Cooperation*. Department for Research Cooperation.
- 96/40 Palme, M, Kilborn, W, Stroud, C and Popov, O. *Curriculum Development in Ethiopia*. Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 96/41 Kenny, L and Petrén, A. *Sida Support to Environmental Public Awareness and Training Projects. Panos, Gemini and TVE*. Department for Democracy and Social Development.

- 96/42 Goppers, K. *Concessionary Credits in Support of Economic Development in Zimbabwe*. Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation.
- 96/43 Davey, R. *Botswana Road Safety Improvement Project*. Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation.
- 96/44 Carr Hill, R and Dawalbeit, A. *Programa de Estudo Graduacao - PEP. Guinea Bissau*. Department for Democracy and Social Development.
- 96/45 Carlsson, J and Wohlgemuth. *Capacity Building and Networking. A Meta-Evaluation of African Regional Research Networks*. Department for Evaluation and Internal Auditing.
- 96/47 Vance, I and Vargas, J. *Local Development Programme in Nicaragua, PRODEL*. Department for Infrastructure and Economic Development.
- 96/48 Muller, J and Svenningsson, P J. *The Planta Nicaragua Rehabilitation Programme Consulting Services*. Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation.
- 96/49 Williams, P and Maxey, K. *Sida Support to the International Institute for Educational Planning, IIEP*. Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 96/50 Peck, L and Hultberg, M. *The Human Factor. Cooperation in Public Administration between Sweden and Mongolia*. Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation.
- 97/1 Goppers, K and Öhlund, S. *Swedish Consultancy Trust Funds with the African Development Bank*. Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation.

List of References

Annex 6

Alberts, T and Andersson, J (1996). *The Environment and Sida's Evaluations*. Sida Studies in Evaluation 96/4. Stockholm: Sida/Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit.

Carlsson, J *et al* (1997). *Using the Evaluation Tool. A Survey of Conventional Wisdom and Common Practice at Sida*. Sida Studies in Evaluation 97/1. Stockholm: Sida/Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit.

Eduards, K (1995). *Evaluating Poverty Reduction within Swedish Development Cooperation*. Stockholm: Stockholm Group for Development Studies.

Schill, G (1996). *Granskning av Resultatanalyserna i Sidas Landstrategiarbete*. Sida Studies in Evaluation 96/2. Stockholm: Sida/Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit.

SIDA (1990). *SIDA Guidelines for Project Support* (Metodhandboken).

SIDA (1994). *Evaluation Manual for SIDA*. Compiled by E Lewin. Stockholm: Sida/Evaluation Unit, Planning Secretariat.

Sida (1995). *Sida's Evaluation Policy*. Stockholm: Sida/Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit.

SIDA (1995). *Guidelines for Result-Based Planning, Management and Monitoring* (preliminary version, January 1995). Stockholm: SIDA.

Sida (1996). *Promoting Sustainable Livelihoods. A Report from the Task Force on Poverty Reduction*. Stockholm: Sida/Department for Policy and Legal Services.

Sida (1996). *Guidelines for the Application of LFA in Project Cycle Management*. Stockholm: Sida/Department for Policy and Legal Service. Methods and Institutional Development Unit.

Sida (1997). *Sida's Programme of Action to Combat Poverty*. Stockholm: Sida/Department for Policy and Legal Services.

Sida (1997). *Sida's Action Programme for Promoting Equality between Women and Men in Partner Countries*. Stockholm: Sida/Department for Policy and Legal Services.

Utrikesdepartementet (1995). *Beredningsordningen för Landstrategier*. Regeringsbeslut 1995-11-26. Stockholm: Utrikesdepartementet.

Sida Studies in Evaluation - 1995/96 - 1997

- 96/1 Evaluation and Participation - some lessons. Anders Rudqvist, Prudence Woodford-Berger
Department for Evaluations and Internal Audit
- 96/2 Granskning av resultatanalyserna i Sidas landstrategiarbete. Göran Schill
Department for Evaluations and Internal Audit
- 96/3 Developmental Relief? An Issues Paper and an Annotated Bibliography on Linking Relief and Development. Claes Lindahl
Department for Evaluations and Internal Audit
- 96/4 The Environment and Sida's Evaluations. Tom Alberts, Jessica Andersson
Department for Evaluations and Internal Audit
- 97/1 Using the Evaluation Tool. A survey of conventional wisdom and common practice at Sida. Jerker Carlsson, Kim Forss, Karin Metell, Lisa Segnestam, Tove Strömberg
Department for Evaluations and Internal Audit
- 97/2 Poverty Reduction and Gender Equality. An Assessment of Sida's Country Reports and Evaluations in 1995-96. Eva Tobisson, Stefan de Vylder
Secretariat for Policy and Cooperative Development.



SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden
Tel: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Fax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
Telegram: sida stockholm. Postgiro: 1 56 34-9
E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>